

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the substantive review in this case. In the final Office Action dated October 2, 2008, the Office rejected claims 1-6. More specifically:

- Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph;
- Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by German Patent No. DE 2,530,312 (Hartwig);
- Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japan Patent No. 11-345,732 (Okuda et al); and
- Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Okuda et al. in view of Hartwig.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended. Claims 7-12 have been added. Independent claim 1 has been amended to further define the invention. Support for the amendments to independent claim 1 can be found in the specification as originally published at paragraphs 0015 and paragraphs 0022-0023. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to conform to amended claim 1. Newly added claims 7-12 define an alternative embodiment of the invention. Support for the newly added claims can be found in the specification as originally published at paragraphs 0009-0016, paragraphs 0022-0026 and paragraphs 0028-0030. Claims 2, 5 and 6 have been cancelled. Accordingly, no new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Upon entry of these amendments, claims 1, 3, 4 and 7-12 will remain pending. For the reasons set forth hereinbelow, Applications request that the §§ 112, 102(b) and 103(a) rejections associated with the pending claims be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office asserts the use of “so that turns are perfectly formed without the need to involve manual work thereon” (claim 1, lines 5-6). Claim 1 has been amended to remove the word “perfectly”, thereby eliminating the indefinite limitation. For at

least this reason, claim 1 is definite and particular points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections associated with now pending claims 1, 3 and 4 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3 and 4

Amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by either Hartwig or Okuda as both Hartwig and Okuda fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 1. *See MPEP § 2131* (stating that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference). More particularly, both Hartwig and Okuda fail to teach or suggest, among other things, “a pressure head mounted on a support around which the pressure head pivots” as well as “a conductor feeder mounted on the support, the feeder comprising a set of clamps such that the conductor to be coiled is positioned tangent to the vertical and horizontal wheels,” both of which are required by claim 1.

Hartwig discloses an arrangement for pressing the turns of an axial progressive winding coil for electrical equipment. *See* Hartwig at 1:1-2. It should be noted that Applicant is referring to the machine translation of Hartwig provided by the Examiner in the Office Action dated October 3, 2008, as is best understood by Applicant. Hartwig provides for a more compact pressure head by removing the pressure cylinders that provide the force to push the pressure head against the coil to a location away from the head. The cylinders also provide for a constant transfer of pressure to the pressure head, and thus to the coils via a mounting rod. This provides for a more compact pressure head, allowing for more compact coils. *See id.* at 3:9-13. In order to provide this constant pressure, Hartwig rigidly mounts the pressure head to the mounting rod such that the head cannot pivot, as pivoting would result in an unexpected change of pressure as applied at the pressure head. Similarly, as the head of Hartwig cannot pivot, Hartwig cannot provide a feeder that mounted on the same support as the pressure head which feeds the conductor tangentially to the vertical and horizontal wheels as the wheels cannot rotate about the coil as it is formed. *Id.* at 5:3-7.

Similarly, Okuda discloses an arrangement for producing a wire coil for electrical equipment. It should again be noted that Applicant is referring to the machine translation of

Okuda provided by the Examiner in the Office Action dated October 3, 2008, as is best understood by the Applicant. Okuda provides for a coil producing technique that takes wire from two spools that may be wound at different pressures, combines the wires and winds the two wires into a coil at a constant pressure. *See* Okuda at 68:2-20. These two wires are combined by a pressure head (item 121 in the figures) which is rigidly mounted to a support arm (item 122 in the figures). Similar to Hartwig, pressure must be maintained in Okuda to provide the desired result, a two wire coil where each wire is wound with the same pressure. This requires the pressure head to remain stable at a constant tension, eliminating the possibility of the pressure head pivoting around the mounting or support arm, again eliminating the possibility of tangentially feeding the conductor to the horizontal and vertical wheels. *See id.* at paragraphs 34-37.

In contrast, claim 1 requires a pressure head mounted on a support around which the pressure head pivots. This, along with the claimed arrangement of “a conductor feeder mounted on the support, the feeder comprising a set of clamps such that the conductor to be coiled is positioned tangent to the vertical and horizontal wheels” provides a means for the pressure head to produce suitable pressure for forming the coils without any added outside forces acted upon the pressure head by the support. Rather than merely providing a rigidly mounted pressure head as is disclosed by both Hartwig and Okuda, claim 1 requires the pressure head to be mounted on a support such that the head pivots.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by either Hartwig or Okuda, as both Hartwig and Okuda fail to disclose each and every limitation of independent claim 1. *See* MPEP § 2131. Further, claims 3 and 4, which depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1, are likewise not anticipated by either Hartwig or Okuda. As such, Applicant requests that the rejections associated with claims 1-6 be withdrawn.

Claims 7-12

Newly added independent claim 7 includes similar limitations to independent claim 1, specifically “a pressure head operably connected to the control unit and mounted on a support around which the pressure head pivots” as well as “a conductor feeder mounted on the support, the feeder comprising a set of clamps such that the conductor to be coiled is positioned tangent to the vertical and horizontal wheels” (see claim 7, lines 4-5 and 12-13).

For substantially the same reasons as set forth above in reference to claim 1, claim 7 is not anticipated by either Hartwig or Okuda, as both Hartwig and Okuda fail to disclose each and every limitation of independent claim 7. *See* MPEP § 2131. Further, claims 8-12, which depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 7, are likewise not anticipated by either Hartwig or Okuda.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. There being no other rejections or objections, Applicant respectfully requests that the current application be allowed and passed to issue.

If the Examiner believes for any reason that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, I invite the Examiner to telephone me directly.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this submission, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0436.

Respectfully submitted,

PEPPER HAMILTON LLP



John R. Brancolini
Registration No. 57,218

Pepper Hamilton LLP
50th Floor
500 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-2502
Telephone: (412) 454-5000
Facsimile: (412) 281-0717
Date: February 3, 2009